

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere, \$2.50. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City.

Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOL. XXI, No. 17

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1928

WHOLE NO. 574

Three leading cities of Pennsylvania

PITTSBURGH
PHILADELPHIA
WILKES-BARRE

awarded adaptions to the

ULLMAN and HENRY Latin Books

Elementary Latin
Second Latin Book

with correlated studies in Latin and English by

B. L. ULLMAN

Professor of Latin, University of Chicago

NORMAN E. HENRY

Peabody High School, Pittsburgh

"Prepared with all the resources available in modern book-making and illustration".

"The illustrations are taken from the latest excavations as well as from the best other sources and make a very attractive feature of the books".

"Copious illustrations presenting phases of Roman life and history that cannot fail to be interesting and instructive".

"The books feel right in the hand and are light. . . . And yet with all the reading matter and their compact size, they boast a wealth of photographs modern with the touch of the 'movie'".

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York

Boston

Chicago

Dallas

Atlanta

San Francisco

The Ideal Series for Schools

Place's Beginning Latin..... \$1.40
 Place's Second Year Latin..... 1.68

By PERLEY OAKLAND PLACE, Litt.D.
Professor of Latin, Syracuse University.

These books make the study of Latin intensely interesting to pupils and stimulating to their imagination.

They make Latin a living language—the language of a real people who lived under somewhat different conditions from ours.

They show how in many ways our language and customs and conditions have been influenced by the Romans and their language.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York Cincinnati Chicago Boston Atlanta

Columbia University in the City of New York

SUMMER SESSION
July 9 to August 17, 1928

Courses will be offered in many subjects in the different schools of Columbia University, parallel and equivalent to those of the academic year, counting toward the degrees of A.B., B.S., A.M., M.S., Ph.D., LL.B., and various diplomas of Teachers College.

GREEK

Elementary Course	(= Entrance Greek a) Professor Eugene Tavenner	Herodotus Tragedy Greek Life and Thought	Professor Clinton W. Keyes Professor La Rue Van Hook Professor La Rue Van Hook
Xenophon	(= Entrance Greek b) Professor Eugene Tavenner		

LATIN

Elementary Course	(For Beginners) Mr. Irving C. Demarest	Odes of Horace	(College Course) Mr. Moses Hadas
Caesar, Gallic War	(= Entrance Latin 3) Professor Clinton W. Keyes	Prose Composition	(Advanced College Course) Mr. Moses Hadas
Vergil, Aeneid	(= Entrance Latin 5) Mr. Irving C. Demarest	Roman Literature of the Early Empire	Professor Marbury B. Ogle
Cicero: Selected Orations	(= Entrance Latin 4) Mr. Paul R. Hays	Vergil, Aeneid	(Advanced Course) Professor Nelson G. McCrea
Prose Composition	(= Entrance Latin 6) Mr. Paul R. Hays	Roman Lyric and Elegiac Poetry	Professor Marbury B. Ogle
Prose Composition	(For Teachers) Professor Hubert M. Poteat	Roman Philosophy	Professor Hubert M. Poteat (For the A.M. degree)
Livy	(College Course) Professor Frank H. Cowles	Prose Composition	Professor Nelson G. McCrea
		Roman World of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil	Professor Frank H. Cowles

ANCIENT HISTORY

Ancient History	Professor Herbert C. Holdridge	Roman Empire	Professor Albert T. Olmstead
-----------------	--------------------------------	--------------	------------------------------

PUBLIC LECTURES ON GREEK AND LATIN SUBJECTS

For Announcement of the 1928 Summer Session, Address the Secretary of
 Columbia University, New York City

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXI, No. 17

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1928

WHOLE No. 574

A DEBT OF CATULLUS TO EURIPIDES

The thirty-fourth poem of Catullus is, in full, as follows:

Dianae sumus in fide
puellae et pueri integri:
Dianam pueri integri
puellaeque canamus.
O Latonia, maximi
magna progenies Iovis,
quam mater prope Deliam
depositiv olivam
montium domina ut fores
silvarumque virentium
saltuumque reconditorum
anniumque sonantum,
tu Lucina dolentibus
Iuno dicta puerperis,
tu potens Trivia et notho es
dicta lumine Luna.
Tu cursu, dea, menstruo
metiens iter annum
rustica agricolae bonis
tecta frugibus exples.
Sis quocumque tibi placet
sancta nomine, Romulique,
antique ut solita es, bona
sospites ope gentem.

This hymn in honor of Diana is written in stanzas of three second Glyconic lines followed by a Pherecratic. Anacreon's first poem also is a hymn to Artemis, written in the Glyconic-Pherecratic meter, divided into a three-line and a five-line system, each ending with a Pherecratic. Lachmann¹, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff², and Edmonds³ believe that this poem of Anacreon is complete. If it is complete, Catullus can owe to Anacreon nothing but the meter.

In the Hippolytus of Euripides the hero comes on the scene followed by a throng of young hunters who are singing the praise of Artemis. Hippolytus calls to them thus (58-60):

"Ἐπεσθ', ἔδοντες ἐπεσθε
τὰς Δός οἴραντας
Ἄρτεμιν, φειδεσθα.

'Follow, follow and sing her praise,
Artemis, heavenly child of Zeus,
Who watches over us ever'.

The last line of the Greek is excellently given by Catullus's first line. Hippolytus, himself a *puer integer*, who has plucked the flowers for his mistress's wreath from an 'untouched meadow' where Chastity makes her garden green with water from the river, says "Ἐπεσθ', ἔδοντες. With this compare Catullus 3-4.

The song of the hunters (61-72) is in the lovely lyric meter which is so often employed by Euripides, with the Glyconic cadence prevailing.

¹Kleine Schriften, 2.87.

²Sappho und Simonides, 113.

³J. M. Edmonds, Lyra Graeca, 2.137, note 5 (for this work see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18.169).

Πότνια, πότνια σεμνοτάτα,
Ζαΐδες γένεθλοι,
χαῖρε, χαῖρε μοι, ὁ κύρα
Δαροῦς "Ἄρτεμι καὶ Δύς
καλλιστα πολὺ παρθένων,
ἢ μέγαν καὶ οἴραντν
ναίεις εὐπατέρειαν αἰλάν,
Ζηνὸς πολύχρυσον οίκον,
χαῖρε μοι, ὁ καλλιστα
καλλιστα τῶν καὶ "Ολυμπον
παρθένων, "Ἄρτεμι.

The rhythm and the sense of the song find echoes in Catullus. Compare Catullus 5-6 with ὁ κύρα . . . Δύς. Catullus has omitted the greeting, χαῖρε, χαῖρε μοι, and has nothing to correspond to the three adjectives of the first line of the Greek; he restricts himself to *magna*. But the likeness in feeling and in phrase is unmistakable.

There are other passages in the play to which one might find correspondences in the Latin poem. I do not lay stress on coincidences of word or phrase that may easily be accidental; I appeal rather to the mood of the hymn of Catullus, so reminiscent in its freshness, beauty, and purity of those qualities in the play of Euripides. I add, however, the lines in the Prologue of the play (18-19),

χλωρὰν δ' ἀν' ὑλην παρθένη συρῶν δει,
κυσίν ταχείας θῆρας ἔξαιρει χθονός,

in which χλωρὰν δ' ἀν' ὑλην suggests *silvarumque virentium*, said in the poem of Catullus (10). The wild outbursts of Phaedra, also, in which she cries out her longing for the mountain and the river and the chase (215-221, 228-231), have an atmosphere which is reflected in Catullus's beautiful verses, 9-12. The chorus of women in the play sings (166-167) of the Goddess of Childbirth, Goddess in the Heavens, and Mistress of the Bow. The epithets *εὐλοχός* and *οἴραντν* give aspects of Artemis invoked by Catullus in 13-16.

The olive-tree mentioned by Catullus (7-8) appears for the first time in Euripides, Iphigenia Among the Taurians 1098-1101, together with the familiar laurel and the palm-tree. In that passage, Artemis, Goddess of Childbirth, *Λοχία*, is called *Δαροῦς ὁδῶν φίλα*, and is said to dwell close to the hill of Cynthus and the palm-tree with fringy leaves, the lovely spreading laurel, and the holy bough of the gray-green olive. The earlier Greek poets tell of the palm-tree and the laurel in the place of Leto's travail. Theognis and the Hymn to the Delian Apollo both speak of Leto as grasping the palm-tree. Professor E. B. England, in his edition of the play (Macmillan, 1886), suggested, in his notes on 1098-1105, that it was an Attic poet who added the Attic tree to the traditional palm and laurel. I add the suggestion that it seems highly probable that the Attic poet was Euripides and that the passage in

the Iphigenia was the first in which the olive-tree enters the scene. In the Hecuba and the Ion, plays which precede in time the Iphigenia, the description of the holy birthplace includes only the laurel and the palm. In the Iphigenia, a play in which the image of Artemis is taken to Athens, and the worship of the goddess is established in Attica, the introduction of the sacred tree of Attica would be singularly appropriate. The olive appears later, in Callimachus 4.262, and in Ovid, Met. 6.335, as well as in Catullus 34.

Catullus, *doctus poeta*, knew Euripides well. Professor Robinson Ellis, in his well-known work, a *Commentary on Catullus*² (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1889), writes as follows in his *Prolegomena* (xxxix): "Catullus was evidently a wide reader, and his translations prove that he was not a careless one...." But no great poet is a mere copier; Catullus, as Professor Ellis says (*ibidem*), "even when he translates most literally transfuses his own nature into the words and remains as Italian as before".

In the exquisite prayer of Hippolytus, after the song of the hunters, the 'untouched meadow' (*ἀνήπατος λευκός*), is the theme. The words are used twice, as if the poet loved to dwell on them. An echo of this comes, as I have said, in the address to the *pueri integri* who are to sing Catullus's Hymn to Diana. The song of the hunters and snatches of other lyrics of Euripides sang themselves, I fancy, in the brain of Catullus till he wrought out the Hymn to Diana, which is an invocation of the goddess in the aspects and in the phrases of the Hippolytus and the Iphigenia. Among the Taurians.

Here is, I believe, a hitherto unnoted example of the power that a word or phrase of one poet has in fructifying the genius of another, so that a new thing of beauty results. This is a phenomenon of which literature offers countless examples.

VASSAR COLLEGE

GRACE H. MACURDY

THE HUMOR OF A MEDIEVAL NUN, HROTSVITHA¹

In Hrotsvitha's plays, in spite of their atmosphere of martyrdoms, prayerful renunciations, and ultimate spiritual peace, there are outbursts of jovial, natural feelings that predicate a lively sense of humor too often repressed. This sense of humor enters very fitfully, by apology almost, with a humble unobtrusiveness; it disappears quickly, too, as if it found itself in strange company. But, when it does appear, it is intensely spontaneous, illuminating, revealing a mind that was by no means cloistered within the walls of a German nunnery at Gandersheim. Hrotsvitha is indeed a sister nun of St. Sylvia of Aquitaine, but she has retained in a marked degree her sense of proportion¹.

¹For Hrotsvitha, reference may be made to the article by Dr. Oswald R. Kuehne, *Recent Literature Concerning Hrotsvitha*, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 20.149-150, and to Professor Casper J. Kraemer's note, *Hrotsvitha on the Stage*, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 20.198-199.

It may be recalled that the names of Hrotsvitha's plays are Gallicanus, Dulcitus, Calimachus [*sic!*], Abraham, Pafnutius, and Sapientia. C. K. >

Calimachus has a weighty secret to impart. To his friends he cries (Calimachus I:148)², *Accedamus in secretiora loca ne aliquis superveniens interrupcat dicenda*. Then he discloses his secret (II, 1:149).

Calimachus. Amo.

Amici. Quid?

C. Rem pulchram, rem venustam.

A. Nec in solo, nec in omni; ideo atomum, quod amas, per hoc nequit intellegi.

C. Mulierem.

A. Cum mulierem diveris, omnes comprehendis.

C. Non omnes aequaliter, sed unam specialiter.

There is a touch here of the Schoolmen's logical disputations, reminiscences of our nun's own Quadrivium, verbal hair-splittings reduced to absurdity.

The following dialogue between Calimachus and Drusiana (III, 1:150) is a piece of gentle, ingenious humor that will later appear in the mild whimsicalities and banter of Oliver Goldsmith.

D. Quid mecum velis, Calimache, sermonibus agere, vehementer admiror.

C. Miraris?

D. Satis.

C. Primum de amore.

D. Quid de amore?

C. Id scilicet, quod te prae omnibus diligo.

D. Quod ius consanguinitatis, quaeve legalis conditio institutionis compellit te ad mei amorem?

C. Tui pulchritudo.

D. Mea pulchritudo?

C. Immo.

D. Quid ad te?

C. Pro dolor! hactenus parum, sed spero, quod attineat postmodum.

Abraham tells Ephraim of the young orphan girl whom he is guarding (see Abraham I:163). 'How old is she?', asks his friend. The circumlocutory answer is worthy of Seneca's thrusts at the poets of his day (Apocolocyntosis 2). Abraham says: *Si unius rotatus mansurni apponetur, duas olympiades vitali aura vesceretur*, 'If the turn of one month were added, she would now be enjoying the breath of life for two Olympiads'.

Gallicanus is off to fight against the Scythians. The Emperor Constantine is ready to offer him high rewards. The following dialogue ensues (Gallicanus I, 6:118):

C. Si aliud expetas, oportet proferas.

G. Immo aliud.

C. Quid?

G. Si praesumo dicere.

C. Et bene.

G. Irasceris.

C. Nullo modo.

G. Certe.

C. Non.

G. Moveberis indignatione.

C. Ne id vereare.

G. Dicam, iussisti: Constantiam, tui natam, amo.

This is in the traditional style of the old comedy—the drawing out of small talk, of statement and rebuttal, the equivalent of the modern stage procedure in joking.

²I quote the Latin text of Hrotsvitha from the edition of her works by Carl Strecker (*Hrotsvithae Opera*: Leipzig, Teubner, 1906). I cite by scenes, and Strecker's pages. The English versions are my own.

Dulcitus looks with longing eyes upon Agapes, Hirena, and Chiona, who have been placed in his charge. He will enter their room. He must embrace them. 'I will sate myself with longed-for embraces', he tells his men (III, 1:141): 'Enter', urge the soldiers; 'we will wait'.

Then occurs a short, rollicking scene (IV, 1:141) vivaciously presented in truly comic vein—farical buffoonery that somehow strips the literary nun of her customary staidness and throws her into the company of Molière. Dulcitus is a brother of Malvolio.

The prison house is dark. Dulcitus loses his bearings.

A. What is that noise outside?
 H. The wretch Dulcitus is coming in.
 C. The Lord protect us!
 A. Amen!
 C. What is the meaning of this clashing together of jars and pots and pans?
 H. I'll look. Come here, please look through the chinks.
 A. What is it?
 H. Look, that fool! He's mad. He thinks he is kissing us.
 A. What is he doing?
 H. One moment he is fondling the jars on his lap; then again he puts his arms around the pots and the pans, giving them sweet kisses.
 C. What a foolish thing!
 H. His face, his hands, and his clothes are so filthy, so soiled, that the blackness that clings to them makes him look like an Ethiopian.
 A. That's how he ought to look, since he is in mind possessed of the devil.

H. There he is getting ready to go away. Let us listen and see what the soldiers waiting at the door are going to do as he goes out.

Later, this dialogue occurs (Dulcitus V:141-142):

Soldiers. Who is this coming out? Someone possessed of the devil. Or rather the devil himself. Let us run.

Dulcitus. Soldiers, where are you fleeing? Stop, wait. Take your lanterns and lead me to my bed.

S. It is our captain's voice, but the appearance is that of the devil. Let us not stop. Let us make haste and flee. The evil spirit will destroy us.

D. I shall go to the palace and I shall tell the court what indignity I am suffering.

Whether this tenth-century nun saw anything actually incongruous in the syllogistic hair-splitting of scholastic argumentation may, perhaps, be questioned. But she certainly seems to hide a sedate laugh in her voluminous sleeves¹. Sapientia has three daughters—Fides, Spes, Karitas. 'How old are they?', asks the Emperor Hadrian (Sapientia III, 8: 204). Her reply is an involved arithmetical puzzle (III, 9: 205): 'O Emperor, if you inquire about the age of the little ones, Charity has completed a number of years diminished and evenly even; Hope, a number that is equally diminished but evenly odd; Faith, a number that is increased and unevenly even'. Hadrian comments at once on the runic riddle. 'By your answer you have not at all made me understand what I asked'. At the Emperor's bidding, she explains thus: 'Karitas

has lived two Olympiads, Spes two *Iusta*, Fides three Olympiads'. Then, asked by the Emperor to explain her expressions, 'diminished', 'diminished', she plunges forth into a two-page disquisition on numbers (205-206), until Hadrian finally sighs: 'What a delicate and fine-spun discussion has arisen from the age of your children!' Surely there is here a pointed thrust, a palpable hit at the wordy frothiness of the Schoolmen. Hadrian's remark indicates that Hrotsvitha was certainly conscious of the laughable incongruity of such a discussion.

SEWARD PARK HIGH SCHOOL,
 BROOKLYN, NEW YORK

HARRY E. WEDECK

REVIEWS

Aristotelianism. By John Leofric Stocks. Boston: Marshall Jones Company (1925). Pp. vii + 165. \$1.75.

In the last few years there has been a great activity in the study of Aristotle, manifest in numerous valuable publications. To name but a few of these, we may mention the general survey of Aristotle by W. D. Ross (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18, 180); the version of the Rhetoric by W. Rhys Roberts, in the Oxford translation of Aristotle, and a more recent version, not so good, but of importance, by J. H. Freese, in the Loeb Classical Library (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 21, 1); Alfred Gudeman's German translation of the Poetics (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 17, 55-56); and W. W. Jaeger's work, Aristoteles: Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung (Berlin, 1923), which serves as a point of departure for Professor John Burnet's "Lecture on a Master-Mind", Aristotle.

As a student of the Poetics, and in making a Bibliography of it¹, I have been struck with a cleavage between those scholars who are interested in the Rhetoric and the Poetics, and those who investigate Aristotle without much reference to either. Of course there are those in whom the cleavage does not appear; yet it does exist, running back to the Middle Ages, when the Rhetoric and the Poetics were not directly known. They were not included in the first printed edition of Aristotle. And to-day Professors Ross and Burnet, for example, evince no great interest in the two works, nor does Professor Jaeger; nor in his time did Grote. A preoccupation with the Metaphysics, the Ethics, and the logical treatises, is, in its way, a survival, a mark of the continued vitality of the Middle Ages. From these, as Professor Étienne Gilson properly maintains (La Philosophie au Moyen Âge de Scot Érigène à G. D'Occam, 1, 8), the development of modern philosophy advanced in an unbroken line.

Professor Stocks's volume, Aristotelianism, is a vital and informing book². Very likely his emphasis upon the metaphysical, physical, biological, ethical, and political writings of Aristotle partly comes from

¹The joint work of Professor Gudeman and myself, now in press, to be issued as Cornell Studies in English, No. 11.

²The book belongs to the series entitled Our Debt to Greece and Rome. The volumes of this series are now handled by Messrs. Longmans, Green, and Company, New York.

*Compare the discussion of Pafnutius and his pupils (Pafnutius I: 179-185).

the fact that the series in which his book appears already has a volume on the *Poetics*, and is to contain another, on *Rhetoric* and *Literary Criticism*, in which Professor W. Rhys Roberts surely will do justice to the commanding position of Aristotle in this realm. Yet one cannot help thinking that the new book still in a measure illustrates not only the cleavage just mentioned, which really is one between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance with regard to Aristotle, but also the more ancient quarrel between poetry and philosophy to which Plato alludes. The peace that was made between them by Aristotle should have been lasting, yet was not.

Mr. Stocks, who is Professor of Philosophy in the University of Manchester, writes his own Preface, and fortunately is not seconded or anticipated in another, editorial, preface. His work consists of three sections: I. Prologue, which is first Biographical (3-12), and then deals with The Socratic Succession (13-33); II. Aristotle's World, in five subsections—Form and Matter (34-50), The Simple Bodies (50-62), The Animal Kingdom (62-80), The Life of Man (80-103), The City (103-118); III. Epilogue, Aristotelianism (119-155), which is mainly based upon Sandys's *History of Classical Scholarship*. There follow Notes (159-163) and a Bibliography (164-165).

An Epilogue of 37 pages is less than one-fourth of the whole. On the scope of the volume we read in the Preface (v):

Some apology seems to be required for the form of this essay, which so far departs from the scheme of the series that the account of the author under discussion occupies the greater part of it and the account of his influence takes a secondary place. But the full story of Aristotle's influence would be a history of European thought....

The scheme of the series has been no better preserved by contributors who had less justification, and made no apology, for departing from it.

Within its limits, then, the book is good; it is spirited, clear, orderly, interesting, and fairly condensed. I cannot reduce the substance of it to the measure of a brief survey that any one would care to read; in the space remaining to me I shall but make casual remarks, partly of a general nature, partly on some particular points.

The sketch of Aristotle's life should have gained much from Professor Burnet's lecture, above mentioned, which was delivered almost a year before this book appeared. Possibly the lecture itself did not appear in time for complete utilization by Professor Stocks; he refers to it in his Notes (160), but not in the Bibliography. Nor does this last contain Peter Petersen's *Geschichte der Aristotelischen Philosophie im Protestantischen Deutschland*, 1921 (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 19.132-133). From the bibliographical reference (164) one could not learn how near the Oxford translation of Aristotle's Works now is to being complete.

Again, the sketch of Aristotle's writings (8-10) does not allude to an apparent gap in his interests which I have often thought should be discussed by

writers on Greek learning. Though Aristotle took the encyclopedia of knowledge for his province, he does not show the relation we might expect of him to the large and obvious discipline of Greek geography that runs from Homer to Strabo. Of his relation to astronomy I shall add something later.

On page 11 Professor Stocks says: "...No author has ever written with a more scrupulous exactitude or with stricter consistency..." This will do for the general organization of Aristotle's works, but not for all details. Certainly he did not have our modern fear of inconsistency in 'cross-reference'³, and his intense scrutiny of facts at one time in one set of relations let him be very inconsistent when he dealt with the same facts at another time in a different approach. A good example may be found in his contradictory statements about the proper outcome of tragic situations, in the *Poetics* (compare my "Amplified Version", 47-48), a contradiction that recently has been explained in a novel way by Mr. Marshall MacGregor in his *Leaves of Hellas* (London, E. Arnold, 1926). Dante and Aquinas wrote with a stricter consistency. We may say so without at all denying the wonderful coherence of the Aristotelian system, or the precision of style with which it is elaborated.

The newest thing should not make us neglect things that are good though older. To any one desirous of a first-rate compendious survey, Sir Alexander Grant's *Aristotle* (1880), one of the volumes in Ancient Classics for English Readers (a series edited years ago by W. Lucas Collins: the volume on Aristotle may be obtained from the J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia), still remains useful. In certain points it needs revision because of the march of scholarship, but these are not points that need much concern the kind of reader for whom such series are designed. Here, for comparison, is the table of contents by chapters: I. The Life of Aristotle (1-29); II. The Works of Aristotle (30-49); III. The 'Organon' of Aristotle (50-76); IV. Aristotle's 'Rhetoric' and 'Art of Poetry' (77-99); V. Aristotle's 'Ethics' (100-116); VI. Aristotle's 'Politics' (117-129); VII. The Natural Philosophy of Aristotle (130-145); VIII. The Biology of Aristotle (146-160); IX. The Metaphysics of Aristotle (161-178); X. Aristotle since the Christian Era (179-196). In this booklet, more compact than Professor Stocks's, but with forty more pages of substance, the account of the *Rhetoric*, a work which Mr. Stocks thinks is "now rather out of favor", is fresh and illuminating. And for other reasons I venture to recommend Grant, as well as

³While speaking of minor inconsistencies, we may deplore the mixture of English and American orthography (for example, "centered", 24, and "centre", 59) which the printer and the editors have given to the British author. A like inconsistency is found in the Notes. On page 162 the letters *lb*, in Note 32 refer, not to the work of Taylor as cited in Note 31, but to that of Sandys as cited in Notes 29 and 30. There have been many comparable inadvertencies in the series. In my own volume I fought the printers successfully to the end, I thought; yet, after that, the ingenious binder divided "Ari-stotle" so on the back of the cover. At the same point in Mr. Stocks's volume the binder has done something queer with "Aristotelianism" that cannot be displayed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*. Now that the series is in the hands of Messrs. Longmans, Green, and Company, we may hope for a better treatment of details in the manufacture of the individual books to come.—One is grieved to meet "claims" (137) in the sense of *contentions*; see Fowler's *Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, 78 (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1926).

Stocks, to those who think that modern science has nothing to learn from Aristotle.

In the Epilogue, Mr. Stocks, when dealing with the more recent students of Aristotle, would seem to devote too much space to Hobbes; more space might well have been given to Bruno, historically a more influential opponent of Aristotelianism. The statement (129), "Dante... who refers to Aristotle more frequently than to any other Greek or Latin author, seems to have known no Greek at all", goes too far in minimizing Dante's unquestionably small Greek, and is otherwise misleading; see Paget Toynbee, Concise Dante Dictionary, in the articles Aristotle and Virgil. But on the whole one may safely praise the Epilogue; we may particularly note the closing words: "...it is Aristotle's special glory that every thinker is his pupil, even when he does not know it". But I must quote no more.

Instead, let me close with a thought that might well have been worked out in this book. By a strange chapter of accidents the joint influence of Plato and Aristotle underlay the fortunes of the so-called Copernican theory regarding the solar system. Aristotle, at all events, might have accepted from Heraclides of Pontus the truth that Mercury and Venus revolved about the sun; and it was but another step from that to the notion that the rest of the planets did likewise, a step that may have been taken in the century of Aristotle, though we do not certainly meet the notion until the time of Aristarchus of Samos in the next century. But as Aristotle was perhaps less interested than some of his predecessors in geography, so he seems to have been less awake than he might have been to the value of what was newest in astronomy, or what was discovered by astronomers outside of the Platonic school and his own circle. Or perhaps his death at the age of 62 kept him from doing what he might have done had he lived, as did other Greek philosophers (as Professor Burnet suggests), to be an octogenarian; had he lived to complete the work of his old age, he might have incorporated the heliocentric theory in his system. But he died leaving his technical treatises in a state that was unsuited to their final publication. And after that these technical works were lost from the time of Theophrastus until the first century B.C.; they were published by Andronicus toward the end of the century. Had they been known during the interval, the scholarship of Alexandria might have assimilated the heliocentric theory to them. When they did come to light, at Rome, there was perhaps no one who could modify the encyclopedia of knowledge in such a way as to effect the necessary accommodation. Then came Ptolemy, who developed the Aristotelian concept of the heavens, which was thus sent down through the Middle Ages with all that remained known of classical lore helping to establish it. So, after the revival of Aristotelian learning in the thirteenth century, Dante's main astronomical authority is Aristotle, *De Caelo*, and Dante's *Commedia* is founded, astronomically, in the Ptolemaic system. Only when the art of printing brought about the diffusion of other astronomical lore was it possible

to revive the heliocentric theory of Aristarchus, which both Copernicus and at least some of his opponents knew he was reviving. At any rate, it looks like an accident that the heliocentric theory did not dominate the Middle Ages, and that there was ecclesiastical opposition to it at the time when it actually was again brought to light. Had it been dominant throughout the interval, what a difference there would have been, for Galileo, for Bacon, for the Renaissance, for the Reformation, and for modern physical science!

Yet the accident need not make us grieve. Had it not occurred, we should have neither the poem of Dante nor things which that poem stands for. The Middle Ages would not have had precisely the balance they did have between the ethical sciences, on the one hand, and the physical or natural sciences on the other. They were hardly scientific in our modern sense, which is a narrow one. We have, in fact, been cultivating the physical sciences with a greater injury to the ethical than the Middle Ages with their proficiency in the ethical sciences did to natural knowledge or to human life. They cultivated those disciplines which are more necessary to the higher forms of living, well aware that man does not live by bread alone. The truth is, we could get along better without a knowledge of the heliocentric theory than without Dante's poem, which is the best fruit of Aristotelian philosophy by its marriage to Christian poetical genius. After all, we have regained the heliocentric theory⁴, and it, too, is a part of our debt to Greece and Rome. In Milton's time, it had not yet sufficiently engaged the poetic imagination, had not acquired riches enough of poetical association, to be of great use in *Paradise Lost* or *Paradise Regained*; Milton employs it in a minor way, to such advantage as he can. But the time will come, and may not be far distant, when the newest of the old and the oldest of the new in modern science will ripen into fruition under the gaze of a poet. For that, however, we need another Dante.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

LANE COOPER

Thucydides: A Study in Historical Reality. By G. F. Abbott. London: G. Routledge and Sons (1925). Pp. vii + 240.

In the Preface to his book, *Thucydides: A Study in Historical Reality*, Mr. G. F. Abbott tells us (v) how he reread Thucydides during the late war, and how . . . The thought then came that a clear and concise presentation of a writer who deals in so masterly a fashion with foreign policy and democracy, imperialism and the struggle for power, might be of interest, perhaps even of practical use, at a time when such problems engage more than ever public attention.

We may make clear the scope of his essay by citing the table of contents:

I. Introductory (1-9); II. The Modern Spirit (10-24); III. The Scientific Method (25-42); IV. The

⁴My remarks on it obviously are indebted to the admirable work of Sir Thomas Heath, *Aristarchus of Samos, the Ancient Copernicus* (Oxford, 1913). This is listed in Mr. Stocks's Bibliography. The lecture of Professor D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson, *On Aristotle as a Biologist*, published at Oxford in the same year, is not listed. I will highly recommend it to any reader of the volume by Mr. Stocks, or indeed of this review.

Philosophy of History (43-77); V. The Personal Factor (78-92); VI. The Demagogue (93-108); VII.-VIII. The Athenian Democracy (109-127, 128-148); IX. Detachment (149-166); X. Art (167-206); XI. Style (207-228); XII. A Possession for Ever (229-236); Index (237-240).

On perusing this spirited and well-phrased book, a reader who expects some startlingly new exposition of Thucydides may well exclaim that there is nothing very novel in it. That, however, is really one of the great merits of Mr. Abbott's volume. His primary aim is to analyze and to appreciate Thucydides, without allowing himself to be side-tracked into, or submerged in, the bog of modern exegesis. Thus, his book can be heartily recommended as an English introduction to the study of the greatest of the ancient historians. There is, of course, a danger in the method followed, and Mr. Abbott has not entirely avoided it, either in dealing with specialized points or in treating more general topics. For instance had he read Mr. A. E. Taylor's article, *On the Date of the Trial of Anaxagoras*, *The Classical Quarterly* 11 (1917), 81-87, he would not have perpetuated the error of placing Anaxagoras's trial just before the beginning of the Peloponnesian War instead of in 450, or shortly after that date. Again, we miss all reference in Mr. Abbott's volume to the remarkably acute and suggestive monograph, *Clio Enthroned*, by W. R. M. Lamb (Cambridge University Press, 1911). A careful study of it would have helped Mr. Abbott to improve his chapters on Thucydides's Art and Style, which seem to the present reviewer the weakest parts of the book. Also, though Mr. Abbott deals effectively with Mr. Cornford and other detractors of Thucydides, and exposes the well-worn absurdity that Thucydides was quite ignorant of the economic factors that influenced the course of Athenian and of Greek history, the remarks of Mr. Lamb on the same topic often go a good deal deeper into the heart of the problem than do Mr. Abbott's. It is amusing to find Mr. Abbott adducing recent examples, including some from Dr. Johnson and Carlyle, of uncouth vocabulary, and then, in the next paragraph (209), referring solemnly to "the nosology of letters", and that too, after he had, earlier in the book (59), introduced us to the word "economaniac". We smile, and, with Polonius, mutter "That's an ill phrase, a vile phrase".

Still, these are trifling blemishes in an eminently sane book. Mr. Abbott deals especially well with Thucydides's method as a historian, vindicates him from the charge of inaccuracy, and has some trenchant criticisms to make regarding the inability of the Athenian democracy to govern an empire, criticisms which remind us of Cleon himself, for whom Mr. Abbott has very little use. The present reviewer, who is by no means in sympathy with those who would at all costs see fifth-century Athens only through rose-tinted glasses, nevertheless feels that Mr. Abbott's strictures on Athens go too far. It still remains a mystery—Mr. Abbott does not solve it—why Thucydides passes over in silence the reassessment of the tribute in 425 B. C. Yet the evidence of the tribute lists seems to leave no room for doubt that the Athenians proceeded fairly,

not arbitrarily, on that occasion. It is legitimate to infer that the increase of tribute in each case was proportionate to the increase in prosperity, estimated in revenue, that had been experienced by each city-state during the half-century since Aristides's assessment. If the Athenians used the confederate funds for their own purposes, it was their navy which above all made the Eastern Mediterranean secure for commerce, and so made a general increase in prosperity possible.

Mr. Abbott, in his anxiety to show how little times and human nature have changed, often adduces parallels between the period of which Thucydides wrote the history and very recent times. Occasionally these comparisons are unobjectionable, or even instructive, but not infrequently they are misleading or false. Thus, to say (130, note 1),

The nearest approach to the modern, and especially to the British, idea of a democracy is to be found in the Spartan Constitution with its limited monarchy, its senate, its popular assembly, and its strong executive of five ministers (Ephors). But even that was more democratic than any modern constitution inasmuch as the ministers were elected annually by the popular assembly, and great questions such as war and peace were decided by this assembly, to which all citizens belonged.,

is to ignore the fact that the *Apella* was itself composed of only a minority. Neither *perioeci* nor helots had the citizen status which admitted to membership in the Spartan assembly. Nor perhaps would one agree that political "probity"—in the sense of a refusal to take bribes or to peculate public money—was as rare in Athens as Mr. Abbott would have one believe; moreover, his reference (119, note 1) to statesmen in Victorian England and in France during the Revolution really does not help his argument. The more favorable estimate of the honesty and dishonesty of Greek statesmen put forward years ago by S. H. Butcher in his short but admirable book, *Demosthenes*, 12-14 (London, Macmillan and Company, 1881), is likely to be a good deal nearer to the truth.

But, though the reader may here and there disagree with what he reads, he will undoubtedly be stimulated by, and profit from, a careful perusal of Mr. Abbott's work.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

M. L. W. LAISTNER

Nicolaus of Damascus' Life of Augustus. A Historical Commentary Embodying a Translation. By Clayton Morris Hall. Smith College Classical Studies, Number IV. Northampton, Massachusetts (1923). Pp. iv + 97. 75 cents.

Herod the Great, the half-Jewish King of the Jews (37-4 B. C.), was richly endowed by nature with all the qualities that go to make a great ruler. He was one of the few who keenly realized that Rome, and Rome alone, was the mistress of the world; he therefore became a faithful ally of Rome, and gained the personal friendship of the Emperor Augustus. Although his acts make it sufficiently clear that, in spite of his brilliant qualities, he remained throughout his entire life a savage at heart, yet he was wise enough to pose

to the Hellenistic-Roman world as a man of culture. He invited to his court a number of Greek scholars and rhetoricians; he conferred high offices upon them and through them he attempted to hellenize Palestine. Among these men was Nicolaus of Damascus, a distinguished philosopher, historian, and poet, who became the king's most intimate friend and his diplomatic agent. Through Herod, Nicolaus met the Emperor Augustus, and later became his friend.

Nicolaus is, therefore, a very interesting figure. Hence, I believe, Dr. Hall would have done better if he had not limited his Introduction to one page, but had given a more extended background for his study. There are several problems relating to Nicolaus which are well worthy of mention, for instance, Nicolaus's value as a historian in general, the debt Flavius Josephus owes to him, and the diplomatic missions which Nicolaus undertook in order to restore Herod to the favor of Augustus.

It is to be expected that an edition of an author should contain at least a short bibliography. Dr. Hall's monograph does not. In addition to the discussion and bibliography contained in W. Christ, *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur*⁶, Volume 2, Part 1, 374-376, there is an excellent account of Nicolaus, with an extensive bibliography, in E. Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*⁷⁻⁸ (Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, 1901): see 1.50-57, 360-418. A short but fine appreciation of Nicolaus as a historian, especially of his Life of Augustus, is to be found in A. Rosenberg, *Einleitung und Quellenkunde zur Römischen Geschichte*, 201, 222-223 (Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1921).

Nicolaus, who was a Peripatetic philosopher, employs the peripatetic method of composition in presenting the order of events in the life and the career of his hero. As a personal friend of Augustus he had access to Augustus's memoirs, and was therefore able to record information which other historians were not in position to relate. As is to be expected, the tone of the Life is highly panegyrical; several circumstances and events in Augustus's career are treated in a way befitting a client who attempts to eulogize his patron.

Nicolaus's Life of Augustus has come down to us in a fragmentary condition, but we are nevertheless able to distinguish in it three separate parts. Part I (Chapters 1-18) contains many an interesting episode from Augustus's early life. It is, however, in general of little value to the student, except, perhaps, in Chapter 18. In that chapter, as Dr. Hall remarks (83, note 3), "...he draws upon Octavian's memoirs and reveals how early Octavian matured his plans to become Caesar's successor in power as well as property..."

Part II (Chapters 19-27) is of the greatest importance. It contains an excursus on the conspiracy against Caesar and his assassination, and an account of the historical developments which took place after Caesar's death, to November, 44 B. C. Rosenberg, *Einleitung und Quellenkunde*, etc. (222), thus characterizes this part:

...Exkurs... der seinem <Nicolaus'> historischen Können ein gutes Zeugniß ausstellt. Er arbeitet

nach trefflichen Primärquellen, und die betreffenden Kapitel sind überhaupt die beste literarische Darstellung, die wir von den Iden des März, ihren Ursachen und unmittelbaren Folgen, aus dem Altertum besitzen.

Part III (Chapters 28-31) gives us the history of Octavian's doings after the death of his adoptive father, his relations to Antony, the latter's plottings against him, and the departure of Brutus and Cassius to the East. The events related in Part III do not go beyond 44 B. C.

I do not intend to dwell upon the merits of Dr. Hall's translation, since this has been well done by Dr. Geneva Misener in *Classical Philology* 20 (1925), 178-180. I may, however, quote her (178):

....But the biographer's rambling and often obscure Greek if it is to be made into readable English requires free and deft handling. In this Mr. Hall has not always succeeded.... Many seeming inaccuracies in translation are due to a confusion of texts....

I wish to add the following observations. In his Preface (iii) Dr. Hall writes; "Chapters 1-15 are from the *Codex Turensis*...." This must be a misprint. I believe that the author had in mind the *Codex Turenensis* (see Dindorf, *Historici Graeci Minores* 1, Preface, 3 [Leipzig, Teubner, 1870]). Further, in Chapter 20 (page 34, line 11), the Greek text shows *Kaioplwra*, but in the translation we have "Cyrus" (compare also page 86, note 4).

I quote now a specimen of Dr. Hall's handiwork as a translator (Chapter 20: page 35):

Something else, such as it was, took place which especially stirred the conspirators against him <Caesar>. There was a golden statue of him which had been erected on the Rostra by vote of the people. A diadem appeared on it, encircling the head, whereupon the Romans became very suspicious, supposing that it was a symbol of servitude. Two of the tribunes, Lucius and Gaius, came up and ordered one of their subordinates to climb up, take it down, and throw it away. When Caesar discovered what had happened, he convened the senate in the temple of Concordia and arraigned the tribunes, asserting that they themselves had secretly placed the diadem on the statue, so that they might have a chance to insult him openly and thus get credit for doing a brave deed by disdaining the statue, caring nothing either for him or for the senate....

The finest part of this book is the running Historical Commentary (76-97). The author quotes here a great number of parallels from Greek and Roman historians and takes pains to point out where Nicolaus's statements are corroborated by them and where they are at variance. Special emphasis is also given to the accounts which are more detailed in Nicolaus than in other historians, and to the accounts which are to be found in Nicolaus alone. The recent historical literature is carefully considered in the Commentary.

In conclusion, it may be said that Dr. Hall's work has a real value, especially since his translation is, as far as I know, the only rendering in English. Together with the Commentary it will prove an asset in the library of a student of the Augustan Age. I should like to see Dr. Hall's book reedited and equipped with an Index.

HUNTER COLLEGE,
NEW YORK CITY

JACOB HAMMER

THE CLASSICAL CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

The 194th meeting of The Classical Club of Philadelphia was held at the Princeton Club, on Friday evening, December 2, with thirty-two members present. The Prize Committee reported that, as the result of the competitive examinations in Greek and Latin held on June 4 last, the Girls' Prize (\$20 in gold) was awarded to Miss Jean Mackey, of the Germantown High School, and the Boys' Prize, of the same amount, to Herman March, of the Central High School.

The paper of the evening, *One More Dialogue of the Dead*, was given by Mr. A. M. Hughes, of the Northeast High School. The paper was a development of the philosophy of Lucretius as the Roman poet himself might have modified it to apply to modern times and conditions. The form of the paper was that of a conversation in Hades between the shades of Lucretius, Anatole France, Mark Twain, and an unnamed youthful American. Lucretius spoke always in iambic pentameters, the others in prose.

The 195th meeting was held on Friday evening, January 6, with thirty-five members and guests present.

Under the title *Slipping Around in Greece*, Professor H. L. Crosby, of the University of Pennsylvania, gave an account of his journeys in Greece last year, with descriptions, appreciations, and historical comments upon places and monuments. He dwelt also on travel experiences of various kinds.

The 196th meeting was held at the Princeton Club, on Friday, February 3, with thirty-three members present. Professor L. A. Post, of Haverford College, read a critique and appreciation of the dramatic art of Menander. An interesting portion of the paper was a comparison of the comedy of Shakespeare and Molière with that of Menander.

B. W. MITCHELL, *Secretary*

THE CLASSICAL LEAGUE OF THE LEHIGH VALLEY

The annual spring meeting of The Classical League of the Lehigh Valley was held at the Moravian College, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, on April 2, 1927.

The first paper, entitled *Farrago*, was presented by Mr. G. E. McCracken, of Lafayette College, Easton. He spoke briefly upon a number of interesting books of a classical and pseudo-classical nature, which had recently come to his notice. One of these was Willis Durant's *The Story of Philosophy*. Three of its chapters are of more than ordinary importance to classical students. They deal with Plato, Aristotle, and Francis Bacon.

Dr. Edgar Riley, of the Department of English, Lehigh University, read an exceedingly interesting paper entitled *Vergil's Influence on Paradise Lost*. The grandeur of Vergil's *Aeneid*, he said, compels the admiration of all ages. The influence of Vergil on *Paradise Lost* is clearly seen in the structure, the character, and the diction of the later work. Neither poem is original in plot.

Neither Adam nor Aeneas is the center of action. Both are victims of superhuman strategy. Milton, imitating Vergil, selects a limited number of heathen deities. The poems parallel each other in length, in long narration of previous events; in frequent invocations, in the chief agents, God the Father and Jupiter, Satan and Jupiter, the Son of God and Venus, Aeneas and Adam, and Dido and Eve.

The attributes of God are conscious imitations of those of Jupiter; the parallel is too close to be mere accident. The Vergilian ease of diction is absent from *Paradise Lost*. The later poem is not in the same manner rhetorical, oratorical. Many phrases of *Paradise Lost* are figurative: metaphors in particular are numerous. Hell and chaos, heaven, sinning man are

portrayed with Vergilian imagery. No other English poet has Vergil's craft; no other has so completely woven Vergilian strands into his own fabric.

Dr. Riley gave numerous quotations from Milton and Vergil to show how marked was the influence of Vergil on *Paradise Lost*.

The annual fall meeting was held on Saturday, November 12, at Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. The following officers were elected: President, Dr. Robert C. Horn, of Muhlenberg College; Vice-President, Mr. Edward J. Lindsay, of the Latin Department of Lehigh University; Secretary-Treasurer, Miss Mary L. Hess, of Liberty High School, Bethlehem. The Executive Committee consists of Dr. Horace W. Wright, of Lehigh University, Chairman, Dr. Robert C. Horn, and Miss Mary L. Hess.

Dr. Ralph Van Deman Magoffin, of New York University, delivered an exceedingly interesting lecture on *The Roman Forum: The Smallest Great Spot on Earth*. The lecture was illustrated with many slides.

MARY L. HESS, *Secretary*

THE NEW YORK CLASSICAL CLUB

The first meeting of The New York Classical Club for 1927-1928 was held in Schermerhorn Hall, Columbia University, on November 19. Miss Edna White, President, spoke briefly of the Endowment Fund Campaign, complimented Miss Beatrice Stepanek, Chairman of the Membership Committee, on the excellent results of her membership campaign, and announced the subject and the speakers for the first meeting of The Classical Forum.

Before an audience that by this time overflowed into the corridors, Professor Michael Rostovtzeff, of Yale University, whose subject was *Some Archeological Notes from Italy*, spoke for an hour. His address and his explanation of the lantern-slides illustrating his address held his audience interested from beginning to end.

In spite of the large audience present, the luncheon at the Men's Faculty Club was delayed only a few minutes. There were one hundred and ten present at the luncheon, about twice as many as the average attendance at the luncheons last year. In addition to Professor Rostovtzeff, guests of the Club were Dr. Edward Robinson, Director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Professor T. Leslie Shear, of Princeton University, and Professor W. L. Westermann, of Columbia University. Professor Shear made a brief plea for the restoration of Greek in American Secondary Schools, and Professor Westermann spoke of raising the standards of the School of Classical Studies in the American Academy in Rome.

The luncheon was over at 2:15.

EDWARD COYLE, *Censor*

A HOMERIC EXPRESSION ILLUSTRATED

The Homeric expression *βοήν ἀγάθος*, is rather strikingly paralleled from old Irish literature in something which appears in an article entitled *The Speculum Principum in Early Irish Literature*, by Professor Roland M. Smith, *Speculum* 2, 411-445. Professor Smith, in discussing the *Audacht Moraind*, which in its present state dates from about 800 B. C., writes (417): "Nere, who is intrusted with delivering the *Audacht* to Feradach, is considered by Thurneysen merely the messenger or herald of Morand... because he is addressed as *nú llgnáth*, 'accustomed to shouting'. But such an explanation seems inadequate. *Núll* may well refer to the shouting after victory customary among the ancient Irish..., and *nú llgnáth* may just as well mean 'accustomed to victory'..."

BROWN UNIVERSITY

RUSSEL M. GEER